PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 7/31/2006
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction act of 1995, no persona are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM			Amaliantian Nivert		10/000 001	
			Application Numb	er - 	10/092,381	
			Filing Date		March 4, 2002	
			First Named Inventor		John Cook	
			Art Unit		1773	
or all correspondence after initial filing)			Examiner Name		Dhirajlal S. Nakarani	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 15			Attorney Docket N	lumber	16728US02	
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)						
Fee Transmittal Fo	Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached		☐ Drawing(s) ☐ Licensing-related Papers		After Allowance Communication to TC	
Amendment/Reply		Petition		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD Number of CD(s) Landscape Table on CD		Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Return-Receipt Postcard Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm or Individual Name	McAndrews Held & Malloy, Ltd.					
Name (Print/type)	ne (Print/type) Jennifer Lacroix		Registration No. (Attorn		46,852	
Signature Junit 2		and		Date: April 21, 2006		
-	7		MAIL DEPOSIT			
"Express Mail" mailing label number: EV 729162335 US Date of Deposit April 21, 2006.						

Summary of Examiner Interview/Record

An interview was conducted between one Attorney of Record, Troy Groetken, and Examiner Nakarani on February 15, 2006. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph was discussed. Examiner Nakarani expressed agreement that amending the claim language of claim 1 to read "from about 1% by weight to about 10% by weight" would be acceptable and overcome the remaining 112, first paragraph rejection of that particular claim. It was agreed that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate the elements of claim 1, including the amendment discussed.

The Examiner further agreed that claims 31 through 36 were allowable if rewritten in independent form as noted in the December 21, 2005 Office Action. The rejection of claims 56 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. 112 was also discussed, though no agreement was reached with respect to potential claim amendments. Further, Examiner Nakarani indicated that support for certain claim amendments could also be envisioned by supplying component specification information.

Lastly, Examiner Nakarani indicated that various grammatical and typographical errors were noted in the specification of the instant application and requested amendments to correct those errors.